

## REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 21, 2004. Claims 1 to 19 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13 and 15 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 4 to 6, 10, 13, 15 and 16 are being amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Office Action responds to the remarks made in Applicants' June 7, 2004 Amendment by stating that June 7th Amendment failed to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c). Reference is respectfully made to MPEP § 707.07(f), which states that a complete response to such remarks should address the substance of the remarks. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a substantive response to Applicants' remarks including specific reasons as to why the remarks are deemed not to be persuasive, should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims.

The present invention generally concerns facilitating data searches using a portable interface, which includes a smartcard. The smartcard includes selectable icons and data filter parameters used to reduce a search space in a search operation. The smartcard is inserted in a reader, in a manner allowing the icons to be visible and selectable. A user's icon selection is detected, and a reduced search space is in turn established based on the detected icon selection and a data filter parameter.

By virtue of this arrangement, the smartcard user is able to use a programmable smart card to perform database searching on a reduced search space using icons and filters provided by the smartcard.

Turning to the language of the claims, Claim 1 defines a customisable data

filter system adapted to reduce a dimension of a searchable data base and to perform one or more of a database search and a data item selection, in relation to the correspondingly reduced search space. The system comprises a Portable Customisable data Filter and Interface (PCFI), a reader means and a database processing means. The PCFI comprises a programmable smartcard adapted to store at least a data filter parameter, and further adapted to provide a user interface comprising spatially distributed user selectable icons made visible on a surface of the smartcard. The reader means is adapted to interface with the inserted PCFI's smartcard, the reader means having a touch screen adapted to allow user viewing and selection of the icons of the inserted smartcard, the reader being adapted to identify an icon selected by a user on the inserted smartcard in user interaction with the touch screen. The database processing means adapted to interface with the reader means, the database processing means being adapted to (a) establish the correspondingly reduced search space dependent upon the filter parameter of the inserted smartcard, and (b) to perform one or more of the database search and the data item selection dependent upon an icon selected from the inserted smartcard.

The applied art, namely Mikurak, is not seen to disclose each and every one of the above-identified features, particularly as regards the features of 1) establishing a reduced search space dependent upon a filter parameter of a smartcard inserted into a reader, and 2) performing a database search and a data item selection dependent on an icon selected from the icons of the inserted smartcard, using the reader's touch screen adapted to allow user viewing and selection of the icons of the inserted smartcard.

Mikurak is seen to describe managing components (i.e., packet-switched

and circuit-switched components) of a network, the network for use in eCommerce applications. With reference to col. 256, lines 25 to 30 of Mikurak cited in the Office Action, a smartcard is merely used to store payment information. While Mikurak discusses filtering content, nothing in the cited portions of Mikurak is seen to disclose storing data filter parameters in a smartcard which also includes visible icons for selection by a user.

At page 4, the Office Action concedes that “Mikurak does not clearly teach to establish the correspondingly reduced search space dependent upon a filter parameter.” Applicants agree, and submit that Mikurak fails to further show a smartcard which stores such filters, and which has user-selectable icons. The Office Action cites col. 180, lines 48 to 67, col. 181, lines 5 to 15 and col. 198, lines 2 to 67. The cited portions are merely seen to describe the use of indexes, and searches based on product number, product name, keywords and questions. While the cited portions refer to programmable filters that may be used to filter out unwanted content, nothing is seen to disclose filter parameters stored on a smartcard, and/or a smartcard which stores filter parameters and has user-selectable icons.

The only portions of Mikurak which are seen to even mention a smartcard are col. 256, lines 25 to 30 (i.e., the portion cited in the Office Action) and col. 259, lines 20 to 26. These portions of Mikurak are seen to describe using a smartcard for digital currency. Col. 78, lines 3 to 39 of Mikurak describes clicking a button and col. 14, line 63 of Mikurak refers to “animated icons”, however this is clearly not the same as a touchscreen of a reader into which a smartcard is inserted, which has user-selectable icons. Nothing in these portions, or any of the other cited portions, of Mikurak is seen to show a

smartcard of the present invention, which stores filter parameters and has user-selectable icons.

Thus, Mikurak is not seen to disclose each and every one of the above-identified features, particularly as regards the features of 1) establishing a reduced search space dependent upon a filter parameter of a smartcard inserted into a reader, and 2) performing a database search and a data item selection dependent on an icon selected from the icons of the inserted smartcard, using the reader's touch screen adapted to allow user viewing and selection of the icons of the inserted smartcard.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 4 to 6, 10, 13 and 15 are believed to be in condition for allowance based on similar reasoning.

The other claims each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Carole A. Quinn  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 89852v1